

say? I do not have to pay overtime anymore. The Federal law has changed; you guys are out of luck.

That is what we cannot have. So, again, we are willing to work with this President. We are willing to work with the majority party. We even bang on their door when they do not invite us to the prescription drug or budget. We bang on the door. And besides sending the Capitol Police, I wish they would ask us to sit down and let us work together. At the end of the day, after we have our voice, after we are heard, whether it is on the House floor or in committee, if we do not have the votes on the proposal so be it. That is the democratic process. But at least give us access to this process. We do represent 49 percent of the people in this country; and, hopefully, after November it will be more than 49 percent.

We just want access, to have an opportunity to have a fair debate with the American people on these proposals, whether it is the President's health insurance proposal, his trade agreements, his environmental policies. We are happy to debate. But do not stick these proposals in these massive omnibus budget bills that no one reads and no one has time to look at, and we run it over to the Senate and rubber stamp it over there and we come back and the President signs it. Because there are many things in there that do affect the well-being of the American people in the gentleman's district and mine. We certainly have a right to be heard on each and every one of those issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree and I appreciate the gentleman coming down here.

I wanted to say one last thing. The manufacturing sector is very crucial in terms of job creation and job retention, for the gentleman's State, for my State, and all over.

The thing that is amazing about it is when I listened to the President last night, when we look at other countries, whether it is Canada or Western Europe or certainly true for China and the Asian countries, they have a national policy that basically dictates trying to create jobs.

If there is going to be a free-trade agreement with Singapore, for example, I am sure that Singapore has figured out how they are going to gain and benefit. If they are going to lose jobs, they will retrain people to create more jobs in another sector.

If you listened to the President last night, it is almost like, that is not my job, that is not my responsibility. He talked about job training, but he did not suggest how job training would be worked in such a way to train for a new job.

We talked about the manufacturing sector. In New Jersey, in my district, we consider ourselves sort of like a little Silicon Valley, the IT sector; health care is a big sector. And even those jobs are now being lost overseas. We have radiologists complaining about

how the radiology is being done in Asia, or the IT sector where the computer jobs are going overseas.

So we have to have some kind of national policy with regard to job retention and job creation. And he does not even mention that. That is not our job. Washington, the President, the Congress have nothing to do with that. So when he talks about job training, I am like, well, what are you training for? You do not give us any details on how somebody is going to be trained to go work for a job that is available. It is very disconcerting.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned throughout this Special Order today, Michigan has lost so many manufacturing jobs, more than any other State. We actually got together, the congressional delegation, and the Democrats in particular, along with our governor, Governor Granholm, and actually put together a proposal, a HELP proposal as we called it: Health insurance, employment benefits, liabilities of the pension fund so they have a pension when they retire, and then a U.S. dollar policy. We laid out a very thoughtful document and sent it up to the White House and the President and asked them to at least comment on it and join with us because no economy in this world can exist without at least a strong manufacturing base; and we are losing it so quickly in this country, especially the last few years.

So we put forth our proposal called HELP. Unfortunately, we have not heard anything back from the White House. I know they have been on break. Now we have the budget wrapped up, so maybe we will take a look at it. But there are, Governor Granholm, some of us in the House and at least on the Michigan Democratic congressional delegation, trying to do something because we feel strongly that if you do not have a strong manufacturing base, service industry is fine, high-tech, all that is fine, but you still need a basic manufacturing base to your country. So we put forth a proposal. Again, we are willing to work with the President on that because we do have to keep good-paying manufacturing jobs here in this country. They cannot all go south, and we have to do some things to help out pensions, health care, employment benefits and the value of the dollar as a big impact on our goods overseas.

So we hope that we can work with this administration and this President in addressing those concerns we have on manufacturing.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I agree. I just want to reiterate in closing what the gentleman said again about the need to work with Democrats. Really, the hallmark of this administration, and also the Republican leadership in this House, has been to exclude the Democrats and not have us be part of the debate. That has got to change because otherwise I think we will never get to a situation where we can have consensus proposals for job creation,

for health care, on the environment that are really going to be meaningful. I think that Congress suffers from the fact that this bipartisanship has essentially disappeared under the Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again.

AMERICA'S DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of this Special Order, and I hope to be joined by several of my colleagues, is going to be narcotics policy in the United States and a number of success stories we have had.

We often talk about the problems and challenges as chairman of the Subcommittee on Drug Policy, the committee that has oversight over all drug issues but also authorizing over the Office of National Drug Control Policy, so-called Drug Czar, Director John Walters. We have authorizing and oversight on all drug issues.

Before I get directly into the subject of this Special Order, I wanted to say a few words about last night's wonderful address on this floor and to this assembly.

If the President had included every single thing of importance and everything we have in our budget, we would still be sitting here this morning. So I first want to thank the President for finishing his speech in 60 minutes.

My colleagues were sharing many concerns that I share as well. That is why our budgets are this thick. That is why we debate all year long on appropriations. But the goal of the State of the Union address is to set a basic vision for where our country is headed; and I thought President Bush did a remarkable job of outlining the major challenges that we face.

□ 1445

We are not a county or a city council. We are not mayors. We are not governors. First and foremost, this body and the President of the United States and the United States Senate have to do international policy. States and local governments cannot do things like the challenges we faced after 9/11 in trying to root out terrorism in Afghanistan, root out terrorism in the funding and the harboring of terrorists in Iraq, to try to break up these networks worldwide, and the President definitely had his focus on the one thing that only the President can lead in and that was our national security. He said, very eloquently, after the first World Trade Center attack and the bombing occurred there, the people were served with subpoenas, they went through our court process, but then the terrorist groups came back and hit us even bigger. We cannot just issue subpoenas. We have to tackle the problem head-on.

He also said in response to some critics that we are not going to get a permission slip to protect the American people. We each took an oath of office to uphold the security of the American people, every Member of this body and the President of the United States, and in spite of all the criticism, it would have been easier to make some compromises last night on some of this stuff but he held firm because he would prefer to win, but if it is necessary to protect American security, he will do what is necessary, and if the people do not understand it and reject him, he can look at himself in the mirror and said I did my best job, I did my best job to defend the American people, I upheld the Constitution to do that. He showed his boldness last night in defending his policies.

By the way, both sides stood up and cheered. On these issues, there was not a my-way-or-the-highway approach. I saw both sides of the aisle standing on almost all of his statements on international security, on Iraq, on Afghanistan. I saw bipartisanship. Not every Member of the other party stood, but most did and most supported, at least many of them, the war resolution itself.

Let me mention a couple of other specifics. For example, I support veterans assistance, too. In my district, I do not have any active bases. I have lots of guard and reserve units, and I voted for and support the continued effort if we are going to use guard and reserve like the military to try to address pay concerns, and we are not going to have an active voluntary military unless we improve pay and health service and all sorts of things for the veterans.

I am on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. I strongly believe we have to do more on the domestic side of homeland security, but fortunately, by disrupting, as the President pointed out, by disrupting the terrorist bases, by disrupting the financial assistance that they have, the places to hide out, they are continuing to try to penetrate us the same ways because they do not have the training grounds in Iraq. They do not have the training grounds in Afghanistan. They do not have the financial networks. They do not have places to hide out right now so we have been able to intercept them, which buys us time to help along the Canadian border, along the Mexican border, to try to get better and faster equipment in our harbors because the cost would be horrendous to try to defend every child care center in America, to try to defend every single harbor, to slow us down so that our goods in the United States go up way in prices as we try to ship them in and out, as we try to check 100 percent at the border. It just cannot work right now.

As we move these machines in, for example, many of these machines at the airport cost \$1.5 million each. One cannot walk down to Wal-Mart and

pick them up. It takes a while for the companies to make them, to implement them at the airports, but because we have disrupted those bases, because they do not have places to hide out, we have not been hit on our soil. Because of the brave men and women in our Armed Forces, they are taking the bullets that were intended for us here.

So we have time to develop our domestic homeland security because of the initiatives the President has done. And the fact is, I know those who would like to throw the incumbent party out of office do not like to admit this, but the economy is recovering, and the economy is recovering in spite of 9/11. In spite of the weakness that occurred after 9/11 in the markets exposing the fraud and cheating of companies like Enron and others who are manipulating the markets, in spite of the uncertainties of war, the economy is coming back, and it is coming back more efficient, and the jobs are increasing not at a fast enough rate.

Underneath that we have some problems. That is why we have the job retraining because we are having reshifting. I hope we address the Chinese currency question and the unfair trade policies of China that are ripping the guts out of my District just like they are in other places and unnecessarily causing adjustments. The President pointed out we needed an energy bill and we need new health care bills because when we talk about jobs, when we talk to industry and the people who create the jobs and the investors, they want the tax cuts. If the Democrats succeed in raising the taxes, they will kill the recovery because when they say they do not like the President's tax cuts, what they mean is they do not want to vote to extend them, and if we do not extend them, as the President said last night, it is an increase.

So, if they increase the taxes, does anybody really believe there will be additional investment to keep our economy recovering? Do people really believe if we increase the taxes on inheritances that small businesses will not disband and continue to sell out to foreign corporations because of inheritance taxes? Do people really believe if we raise capital gains taxes again that people will expand their companies and add jobs in their companies? Do people really believe that if we increase their income taxes, and as the President said last night, everybody who pays taxes got a tax cut. The only people who did not get a tax cut are the people who do not pay income taxes. They did not get an income tax cut because they do not pay income, but if you pay income, you got a tax cut, and by giving more dollars to people, people were able to invest and now help lead the stock market recovery.

After 9/11 if we had not given the \$600 to individuals, I just cannot imagine where our economy would be, and then the child tax credit, can my colleagues imagine the pressures on families trying to deal with health care and hous-

ing costs and clothing costs if all of the sudden the Democrats succeed in taking back the tax credits? We will have a disaster in the economy. That is why the President talked about taxes last night and health care last night and some adjustments; and he talked about Medicare, too, which is important with seniors.

The only area where we did not really have bipartisan support was when the President addressed social issue. When he talked about abstinence education, it was really disappointing to see that become a partisan issue. Since when has abstinence before marriage become a partisan issue? That was really sad. Since when did the Defense of Marriage Act, which even President Clinton signed, that said marriage should be between a man and a woman forever, when did that become a partisan issue? When did drug testing and drug prevention programs become partisan?

I am concerned about the divides on the social issue area because, in fact, we had the bipartisan support for the Medicare bill. It could not have passed if we had not had literally dozens of Democrats for that bill. The tax bill would not have passed without Democratic support. We would not have been able to pass the war resolution without Democratic support, but on things like faith-based, on abstinence education, defending marriage in the United States, we do need to have bipartisan support. We need help from the other side. We cannot just have those issues be Republican issues, and it was really disturbing last night to see that division, and when it is viewed as the President interjecting partisanship, if he raises the subject of abstinence education, my lands, how is that partisan? If we say I believe marriage should be between a man and a woman that is partisan?

Those people who criticize faith-based organizations as being partisan have a problem right now. Where has the consensus and the moral foundations of America gone? I thought the President laid that kind of comprehensive vision, not the particulars that will come in the budget, but the comprehensive vision of a strong America that stands up against evil in the world, wherever it is coming from, an America that is founded on letting people keep their own money, of trying to create job creation, not have Washington drive everything, not having lawsuits drive our economy but having the people that are investing in it drive the economy, and a moral, Judeo-Christian-based foundation in America that treats people decently and accommodates all kinds of religious diversity as people move into our country but understands that faith plays a key role in our Nation. That was the vision he laid out.

Now it is our job as Congress to take his budget that he proposes to us and get into the specifics of how we fund the National Guard and what we do in

the national parks. I have worked with my colleague from New Jersey on fish and wildlife issues, on human rights issues. We do that stuff on a regular basis, but last night we had an amazing presentation on the basic vision of where we are going in America, and I was excited by that speech.

One of the things the President also addressed was a few new anti-narcotics initiatives, but I think a lot of people missed something he said right at the beginning of his new initiatives on drug testing and prevention and trying to correct steroid abuse in the United States, and that is, that we have had a drop in illicit drug usage in the United States of 11 percent in the last 2 years. It is an extraordinary thing.

I get a lot of flak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. The drug legalizers groups, and groups funded by George Soros that masquerade as large citizen groups but get their money mostly from George Soros and his few allies who are billionaires to try to legalize drugs in the United States, hiding behind so-called medicinal marijuana which is not medicinal at all, and heroin needles, distribution, free heroin clinics and all this type of stuff, really predominantly a drug legalization movement funded by George Soros and his allies. Those groups do not like me. They do not like anything that comes out of our committee, and they are constantly harassing us.

They opposed and were just really crushed when the ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the National Ad Campaign passed this House by voice vote. They were just crushed because they had this idea that there was going to be this big uprising and drug policy would be defeated, but the fact is we have done drug policy in a bipartisan way. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee, he and I do our best to work together on all issues, to draft the bill together. He had multiple amendments. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and I often do not see eye to eye on other things, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman of the full Committee on Government Reform, and I do see eye to eye, and we have our differences at times with the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), but we realized on drug policy we needed to stand together and worked to address the evils. By doing that, we have had a reduction.

Often, I will come to the House floor and talk about the problems of Oxycontin and the rise in meth and the struggles in Colombia and Mexico and Canada and in Afghanistan, but the truth is if all we hear is the struggles, we miss the part of the success story, that in fact, the money we have been spending, by raising the struggles, by raising the problems, the money we have been spending has actually been working.

Those who are libertarians, or I would call liberal-tarians, whether they be far right or far left anti-government people, want a line and say government programs never work. No government programs can tinker at the edges. Job creation predominantly comes from the private sector, but incentives can help, that in education it should be mostly at the local government but had we not addressed through IDEA and certain civil rights legislation many people in American would not have had a chance, and the Federal Government needed to directly step in. Clearly in housing, had the Federal Government not stepped in in certain areas, there would not be some of that social safety net. That is not the primary. From a concerted perspective, I think it is secondary, but in some groups, it was very primary and important.

Same thing in narcotics policy. We have most law enforcement is State and local. Most treatment is State and local or private sector through insurance. Most of these things are done through the private sector, but the government plays a critical role, and let me read a few of the accomplishments this year through the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

One of the most visible is the national campaign against marijuana which is probably why there has been such an outcry and an angry frustration with some of our policies, because the one thing they do not want to happen was marijuana. So let me address that a minute.

We hear, and as I started to point out, about all the negatives and then we start to think it is not working, but in fact, we have made progress. We have these peaks that drug use in the United States went up in the 1960s, dropped, went up again, dropped under Reagan, went up again. By the way, we would have to reduce drug use in the United States 50 percent to get it back to where it was when President Clinton took office. We can argue with subgroups in that and some went up higher than others and some drugs went up higher than others, but we are making progress now partly because, quite frankly, we had a balloon when our national policy from 1992 to 1994, our national policy was hear no evil, see no evil, do no evil.

From that perspective, what happened was is the President started joking about I did not inhale. They cut the drug czar's office from 120 people down to 23 people. They cut the interdiction money going to South America by dramatic amounts, and guess what, cocaine and heroin flooded into our country. Marijuana flooded our streets. The stigma went off like it did in the 1960s. The grades of marijuana went up in their potency from 5 to 8 percent THC to 15 to 25, in some places, 40 percent THC, where marijuana is as potent and as dangerous as cocaine and sells for that amount in the streets. Those changes in 1992 and 1994 were dramatic.

President Clinton, to his credit, after the Republicans took over and after a little bit of arm twisting, brought in General McCaffrey to head the drug czar's office, gave him dollars, and since 1995 we have had pretty steady progress for 8 years. The first couple of years were more to flatten out the trends, then to get like a 2 percent, and last year, there was an 8 percent reduction in marijuana. People who say the national ad campaign does not work are wrong. The fact is, by educating people, not just hammering off over the heads and saying, look, you are going to wind up forever destroyed if you use marijuana, no, not everybody who does winds up destroyed, but you cannot get at cocaine, heroin, meth, oxycontin and other abuses as a whole unless you get at marijuana, because marijuana and alcohol abuse, but for the other hard drugs, marijuana basically is an entry level drug.

□ 1500

For every 10 marijuana users, one, or maybe two, counting high-grade marijuana, will move into a harder drug. If you have 100, you will have 10 over here. If you have a thousand, you will have a hundred over here. If you have 10,000, you will have a thousand over here. The percents stay roughly the same.

Because once you are introduced, a certain percentage will become addicted, whether psychological or physical. A certain percentage will want a higher hit, a bigger and longer impact of the narcotics. And the next thing you know, you have more addicts.

So to make a really dramatic reduction, Director Walters decided to go at marijuana. So the national ad campaign showed all kinds and they studied particularly target youth groups. I hear a lot of people say, I do not see a lot of those ads, or I do not particularly like those ads. Well, guess what, 53-year-old white guys like me are not the primary target. Not saying there are not 53-year-old white guys who are abusing cocaine, but we are not the prime target. We are trying to get people at the entry, at the gateway coming in and getting addicted. By the time you are 53, if you are addicted, you need a treatment program. And we are working with the treatment programs and trying to do that. What we need to do is get at the people as they are coming into the system.

I see I have been joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), and he has been a leader in the drug-testing area. If I can, let me make a brief introduction on the drug testing.

Last night, the President proposed an initiative for \$25 million for drug testing. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been looking at this issue for some time. I worked on this when I was a staffer over on the Senate side with Senator Coates years ago. So let us say this as point blank as we can. Drug-free prevention programs and treatment programs will not work without

drug testing. You have to have an accountability. The President last night said that as part of our prevention treatment programs we are going to put in some measurement sticks, just like he talked about in education and just like he talked about in other areas, and one of those things is drug testing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my friend from Pennsylvania to talk about a little of that and whatever other issue he wants to talk about.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who is the leader in Congress on this issue. I want to commend him for these efforts because these are not issues that are pushed by the power brokers in this country or pushed by the big PAC givers. These are the issues that are at the heart and soul of America's kids and who, I feel, have more peer pressure today to deal with the drug issue than any generation before them.

This used to be a city issue. For years, maybe decades, the cities have been infected with drugs. But I hear the experts today say there is not a community in America that does not have a drug problem. Now, one of the problems we have is a lot of those communities do not realize the severity of the problem and sometimes kind of just want to look by it as long as it has not impacted them or their families or their neighborhoods.

I represent a huge rural district in Pennsylvania, one of the largest rural districts in the eastern part of the country, and I have hundreds and hundreds of small towns. I have not talked to a youngster in my office that does not tell of the severity of the drug issue in their school and the easy availability, marijuana being available in middle school. Sometimes kids will actually smoke a marijuana cigarette before they smoke tobacco because it is easier to buy. They do not have to have an ID card. Stop and think about that.

Jonathan Walters, the Drug Czar, was with me in my district about a year ago and is doing a wonderful job. I will never forget the face of a young lady, 16 years old, who lived in a small town of about 6,000 people. This is an area you would think would not be infested with drugs. When she was 14 she was using three bags of heroin a day. The young people in that school were driving into north Philadelphia and they were buying pure uncut heroin.

The tragedy of that is that usually heroin is the drug for the end-of-the-line user. When people got hooked on heroin, they had worked their way all the way up the food chain. Heroin is such a powerfully addicting drug, it is usually just a matter of time until their life is over. But here we have 14-year-old and 15-year-old and 16-year-old teenagers who are into heroin. I have probably 10 or 15 communities in my district that have known heavy heroin use in kids.

The power of it is that it is uncut pure heroin that is affordable and

available. And the problem with that is it is so addictive that the drug counselors tell me if you have any kind of an addictive personality you may never lick the habit. Now, this young lady, I said to her, what is your wish? Well, she said, my wish in life is that I had never touched it. I am on my second rehabilitation program, and I hope I can stay drug-free. I do not want to ever do drugs again.

But the addiction is so powerful, and when you take young people like that, who are not even mature as an adult yet, and give them uncut heroin, or uncut cocaine, or the one that has been terribly impacting my region also, which is methamphetamine, where it is manufactured in laboratories out in the country, in homes and garages and barns and buildings, it is about as addicting as heroin and about as powerful. And I am told many times people who may be first- and second-time users will fight that addiction the rest of their life.

So those who think testing is an intrusion of privacy, I want to plead with you that testing is the only way parents know, it is the only way a family knows, it is the only way schools know what your child is doing. And if you have it to where schools participate voluntarily and parents approve of their kids being tested, I would test all kids that parents would allow the test. Leave it a freedom of choice of the family, but I would make it a negative check-off where everybody gets tested.

Now, that is not where most are at today. But I listened to the debate at the Supreme Court when they expanded from sports activities to all extracurricular activities, and some schools have gotten creative and said kids driving their cars to school, because assuming you drive your car to school, you are more likely to be bringing drugs in here.

I had an argument with a nationally well-known figure, and if I mentioned his name you would all know him, but he was arguing on a national television show against testing, so I said to him, well, if my memory is correct, 15 or 20 years ago the military had a rampant drug problem, and random testing fixed it. He stopped, he paused, he said, yes, I was there. I was a part of that. I had never related it, but you are right. I change my position at this moment. I would support random drug testing.

So today I introduce the Empowering Parents and Teachers for a Drug Free Education Act. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) joined me and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). That is a band of three. But I think it is legislation whose time has come.

I cannot tell you how excited I was last night when the President put sufficient emphasis on this. It is not about privacy. It is about helping young people who are now being exposed to drugs that are so powerful that if they use them once or twice they may be addicted the rest of their lives. So it is preserving their life.

It is not about drug enforcement. It is about when you find a youngster that has drugs in their system that the parents get involved, and then the schools get involved to first help them with this problem. A youngster into drugs without help will soon be too far down the road that they will literally owe their life to the drug dealers.

When you look at who the drug dealers are, we know today for a fact that terrorism is often funded by drug dealers. The drug dealers of America in our small towns are the scourge of this country. They are the low life who care nothing about the future of our youth, care nothing about the future of this country. They are just interested in the mammoth profits they make selling this poison to our young people.

I will never forget the discussion I had last year with my granddaughter Nicole. We were going shopping after Christmas, returning some things and spending some of her money she had gotten for Christmas, and we always get on this subject. And she said, Pop, why are you so concerned I will get on drugs? I am a good student. I am doing well in school, she said. I am not going to do drugs, Pop. So I said, well, who do you think will entice you to do drugs? She said, oh, some creep at school or somebody that will come. I said, no, Nicole, that is not who will introduce you to drugs. The person who will introduce you to drugs is one of your best friends, like Jacquelyn, whose boyfriend or friend has, maybe at a party where she has had a couple of beers, even though that is not legal, but her judgment is impaired and she tries them. When she tries them and has gotten into that habit, she is going to want her best friend, Nicole, to be with her.

It is not some creep that introduces our kids to drugs. It is somebody who is their friend. It is somebody who they have an established relationship with. I guess the thing that scares me, and that I wish school superintendents would be more scared of, and I wish parents would be more fearful of is that their child, without any doubt is going to have numerous opportunities to do drugs. Even if they are not an avid drinker, even if they are not into the other things where they are more likely to, there will be a time. So we must help these young people.

In the workplace today it is common practice. You sign a form, and in most cases they say we will be randomly drug testing. That is the way of the work world. In the military, you will be randomly drug tested. And I find there is no tool to help get drugs out of our schools. If I were president of a college, I would have on the application form that you will be randomly drug tested. And I would promise the parents that brought them there that my first goal would be to run a drug-free college. It would be difficult, but it would be my number one goal. Because those are still those formative years.

The kids tell me that the age at which they are asked to do drugs is

getting younger and younger and younger. And when you get down to 8th and 9th graders, who are not that mature yet, who are more vulnerable, and the drugs are more available to them, and they are more potent than they have ever been, a lot of them are pure and uncut, and at that those young ages, if they try once, they may never lick the habit.

I thank my colleague for the chance to join him.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my fellow colleagues today in applauding our President last night for his position on drug testing, and I would certainly agree with what my colleagues have just said, because young people today are faced with this onslaught.

First of all, we have a media around them, entertainment media, et cetera, that actually breaks down their ability to make the right decisions for their lives in the long run, and drug testing would not only go a long way in terms of just identifying a young person whose parents need to know that they are vulnerable and are perhaps making some wrong choices in their life, but drug testing also gives these young people an added incentive to say no.

Without drug testing, if you are talking about your daughter going to a party or something and having a few beers, there is nothing she can say to the person proposing using drugs except, well, that is wrong and we should not do that; my parents have told me that is wrong. And that is about as neat a thing to say at a party as I guess let us listen to Bing Crosby music or something like that. But if there is drug testing in school, young people will know what to say. And what to say is I cannot take this drug because I may be tested for drugs in my school tomorrow. And if I get tested for drugs and I am positive, my parents will know about it.

And as far as I am concerned, any young person who is found to have drugs through drug testing, and there should be drug testing in our schools from junior high all the way through, not only should their parents be notified but the student should be able to then face an extra hurdle to jump over before graduation. And that hurdle should be a class that they need to take that will demonstrate to them the evils and the threat that drugs have for them as an individual. We need to let this child, who is now a young person, sit through a few films and some personal stories about how drugs have destroyed the lives of other young people and make that mandatory if that young person tests positive for drugs.

□ 1515

They would have to get a passing grade. And I would suggest that if someone has tested positive for drugs

before they get their degree, they have got to test so they are not on drugs. In other words, we have got to provide positive incentives for young people not to get involved in this type of behavior in the first place. Again, I would applaud our President for taking a positive approach. I have some disagreement with some of my other colleagues as to how effective the war on drugs is and how effective just focusing on enforcement or interdiction is. I do not think they have been effective at all. That is why we have got to try this personal approach, personal responsibility, focusing on identifying those people who are vulnerable, especially focusing and identifying people who might make us vulnerable. Airline pilots, doctors, people who our lives are in their hands, they all should be drug tested, but then especially testing young people to make sure their parents can know that there is a challenge and giving an incentive for these young people to say no when they are offered these drugs.

I would join you both in applauding our President and hope that we can stimulate people across this country to look at drug testing as a positive alternative rather than some sort of threat to privacy. The only way it would be a threat, I would say, to civil liberties is if drug testing is mandatory and then we believe that we are going to prosecute young people for using drugs. That would be self-incrimination in my point of view, but I do not think that is what is being advocated here. What is being advocated here is drug testing in order to facilitate some type of outreach program to get someone so they are not using drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to reiterate the gentleman's last point. This is a prevention and interdiction tool to help reach people before they become heavy addicts. That is why it is targeted at the schools. There is a body of law that has to be followed. This program will be thrown out in any school that does not follow the body of law. In 1989 and 1990 in the omnibus drug bill, my former boss in the Senate, the junior Senator from Indiana, whose name I guess I cannot say here on the floor, that we had an amendment based off of a high school in West Lafayette, Indiana where the baseball team had an outfielder who got hit on the head with a fly ball. And he was a very good fielder. The question was, how did he miss a fly ball?

A similar thing happened, I think, to the third baseman. In that process, they decided to drug-test their baseball team. They found that one-third were high. So they decided to put in a policy of drug testing on athletes and then cheerleaders. We took that as an allowable use then in the drug-free school bill, in the 1989-1990 bill, and put that in as an allowable use. It was then attempted to be expanded in Texas and a few other States student-wide. The court initially just upheld where there was extra risk in athletics and then as

our colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, it broadened it in a recent court case to go to the next step. But in the legislation it was very explicit.

We also did this in the drug-free workplace. We did it on truck drivers' testing. The test has to be either a total classification or purely random. They cannot say, "That guy has long hair. I think he's doing drugs. I'm going to test him. I'm not going to test this." In a company you need to test the management and the owners, not just the employees. You have to have equitable treatment, including us in Congress should be testing ourselves, even though technically we are exempt from this. If we are going to put it on government employees, we ought to be doing it ourselves in our offices.

The second thing is related to that, the type of tests and how you do the tests are by law required. If you are going to use a urine test, there are standards of how you keep that, how you sort it, how you mark it, that you have a second test so you do not get any false positive with it. Hair tests and follicle tests are much better and harder to mix up. There ought to be a logical appeals process with it. In other words, if you deprive people of their civil liberties in the process of this, even students in loco parentis, you got a problem. But the fact is, if you do it right, it is the best prevention and identification deterrent.

To share one of the stories from my district, I was at a school which was doing it in athletes. I like drug testing, like both of my colleagues, and proposed that it ought to be used more widely. The student body president objected and said this is a violation of my liberties. A couple of other people objected. And then one student got up and said that he had been abusing marijuana, got caught, his life had been going downhill, that that forced him to confront it just like the gentleman from California referred to and said he talked to his parents, got his life straightened around and he believed drug testing would be good.

Then somebody else from the student government objected again and a couple of the other students spoke up. And when we were done, the principal and superintendent came over and said, "We're implementing school-wide drug testing because every single person who spoke up against it has never had a drug violation or suspected but every one of the kids who spoke up for it had either had a problem or we wondered if they did." They were crying out for help, for accountability from adults in a society that does not care. That is another aspect of it. If they think they are going to go to jail, they are not going to speak up, but if they think somebody is going to reach out and love them and help them, I believe, and I believe our policies in the United States need to be focused not on legalizing the behavior, but we recognize that very few actually go to court for one-time marijuana use.

You cannot be our age and have gone through the 60s and the 70s without knowing lots of people who did marijuana, and I do not personally know anybody quite frankly who went to prison for just smoking marijuana. If they went to prison for that, they were probably involved either in multiple parties or dealing or driving somebody or something more extensive. As a practical matter, that is what we are trying to bust. My colleague from California and I have strong disagreements about Colombia policy and some other things, but on this type of thing in prevention and the treatment programs, quite frankly, these treatment programs that take all this money and do not want to measure whether their clientele are abusing when they come out, hey, that is a big problem. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. If the gentleman will yield, as I said, I believe that the interdiction effort and the efforts, punishment, et cetera, have not succeeded. One of the reasons that it has not succeeded in our society, what we have is laws on the books that supposedly make something illegal, yet we have, by our own actions not put a societal stamp of disapproval. In fact, by not having drug testing and by not having, as Ronald Reagan used to say, a Just Say No mandate, or a societal norm that is unaccepting of drug use as personal behavior, what we have done is we have got laws that are unenforced, so officially supposedly it is against the law, but at the same time, the norms of society are accepting drug use. I think that drug testing will make sure that young people know absolutely fully well that society has a stamp of disapproval on drug use. Right now it is very nebulous as to whether or not our society is against people using drugs or not. This would be a clear message to young people, saying that society is so much against it, we are even going to test you and if you are using drugs, we are going to send you through a special program to make sure that you know how harmful this can be, and so there is no question in these young people's minds.

The gentleman is right. Young people are looking out for guidance. Frankly I believe that if you threaten them, and I know we disagree on this, if you threaten them, sometimes it is almost titillating for kids to get around those type of rules where the sheriff comes up and we're going to put you in jail or something. But when you have to say you are not going to get your driver's license if we find out that you have been using drugs, you are not going to graduate, there is no getting around that. That is a real life stamp of disapproval. I think this would be very effective.

Again the gentleman is right on target for congratulating our President and applauding him for making this an emphasis in his State of the Union speech.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I have had young people and other peo-

ple who were opposed but most of the young people who come in my office support drug testing. They would like to see that down pressure on their friends who are struggling with the decision-making process.

Several years ago I was discussing this issue with a radio commentator on a big city talk radio program. He was making fun of me, according to the people who were listening to the station, prior to me coming on, that we are going to talk to the Congressman that wants our kids to fill a cup with urine and just was kind of making light of it. At the end of that discussion that day after I was off, one of my staff was listening, he said, you know, I was pretty opposed to this idea, but after the discussion, if I had a 12- or 14-year-old boy, and I don't, would I want testing or would I not and he had a long pause and he said, you know, I think the Congressman convinced me. Just the matter of having a discussion.

We have other tests. We have the hair test, which I think is one of the best because it reaches back. If you tested in September, you know the activity for months before, because the hair holds the drug. You have saliva tests, you have sweat tests, of course you have the blood tests, the urine tests. There is lots of testing today. One of the deterrents to schools doing it is the cost, especially in a small rural school district with there is not much extra cash to go around. That is what is so vital about the President's program saying, hey, if you decide, if the parents in your community talk to your administration and say we would like our kids tested and you develop a testing program, we're going to help. That is what this is about. This is not a mandate. I know in my district, I am going to be selling it. The young people want me to sell it. We need to encourage parents and community leaders to encourage school boards to move out and say, let's do everything we can do to make our school drug free. I have superintendents who are there. I have lots of superintendents who are afraid of the issue.

But I have had a couple of superintendents who have said they bring in dog teams, they bring in a drug enforcement officer, they bring in people who tell about the lives of people who got addicted to drugs and how their life was really over. Parents would have the right to veto if they did not want it. That keeps us out of the ACLU and the courts. In my view, I think there are a lot of things we can be doing, and what we are doing it for is the kids.

Joe Paterno is a strong proponent of drug testing. He has been coaching young men for a long, long time. On my very last time with him, as I went to leave the room, he said, Pete, you keep pushing that drug testing. I want to tell you, over my years of coaching, and I have been drug testing for some time, one year I let up and the next spring camp I saw some of my boys back from last year who I suspicioned

may have at times been on drugs, and I hadn't tested much that year and I saw more signs, because as a coach he knew, he could tell by watching their play in spring camp whether they had been using drugs or not. I do not know how he told.

He said, I want to tell you, I'll never make that mistake again. I continue to do more and more and more testing because testing works.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank both gentlemen for talking about drug testing. I want to put this a little bit in the context, because that was a critical part of the State of the Union last night to talk about that in particular, but once again as the President said at the front of that section, that, in fact, we have had a reduction in drug use in the United States. That is partly because we have a holistic policy that the drug testing is a key component of the accountability and the measurement.

As both of my colleagues have pointed out as well as myself, but particularly the gentleman from California, it is a stigma part that one of the things, I have been to Colombia now about 10 times and in multiple countries, particularly in the Andean region, where because of our demand, because we cannot control our demand, we are disrupting and overturning democracies that have been there for hundreds of years.

In Colombia, I think it was actually in Ecuador, in Guayaquil, a young student came up to me and said, why do you keep picking on the Andean nations? When I went to school in the United States, I saw no stigma at all. You could get dope in any college, you could get it from anybody. Why don't you put some stigma?

That is partly why I offered the amendment that is a very unpopular amendment but basically says if you get convicted of a drug crime and you are taking money from the taxpayers of the United States you're going to lose your loan. We have had arguments about how that has been interpreted and I do not agree with how it has been interpreted and we are trying to fix that but the bottom line is if you take somebody else's money, you should follow the laws of the United States. We cannot go to Colombia and say stop growing this stuff if we do not do things here like drug testing and that.

In Colombia, interestingly in this past year, we have had the most successful year yet, we are still struggling but we have had the most successful year yet in stabilizing at least large sections of that country. We have, in addition to having sprayed all but some concentrated areas of coca, which is why the attacks are getting so vicious, why we had some Americans shot down, why we have had our planes taking more hits than they ever have because we are not spraying the whole country anymore, we are spraying concentrated areas that are hard to get to and the drug dealers are digging in to fight to keep us from eradicating, but we have had the best spraying year.

One hundred fifty municipalities now have a government presence in them instead of just having the right-wing terrorists come through who originally were trying to protect the towns but were not government units and the left-wing FARC which provides protection for the drug growers fighting with each other, terrorizing the individual people. There is now a government presence since President Uribe took over in 150 municipalities that did not have it. They have had more than 300 projects and 25 departments benefiting displaced persons, rehabilitating child soldiers, providing legitimate employment opportunities. It is part of our Andean initiative to make sure that we do not just spray, we do not just eradicate but what are we doing for the people who are being disrupted because of our habits, our habits and western Europe.

□ 1530

Then the question is if we cannot get it there, we have got to get it in interdiction. Because of pulling a lot of our Coast Guard units in and some of the other things in around Homeland Security, we have had some gaps; but we have been doing reasonably well, particularly on the south border. For example, a couple of DEA busts along with the stigma on LSD, when we can tackle it, much like we are trying to do with meth and OxyContin hopefully too, this is the pattern of emergency room, when somebody comes in, do they mention that they were high on LSD? As we can see, it has dropped from 5,000 in 1999 to 891 in 2002.

In my home area in northeast Indiana, we had a similar drop. We had a jump up in LSD. We battle it hard; we interdict it. The DEA did a major undercover bust with it. We had publicity on attacking LSD, and when we put on the stigma combined with enforcement, it will drop.

Meth is a huge challenge, and it is a growing challenge. Even though all of us see the little labs, I want to make just a brief education point on meth because most Members here, if we ask them what is the fastest-growing category, everybody would say meth, but it is actually still only 8 percent of drug use, and 80 percent of the meth is coming from superlabs in California and Mexico even though we are seeing all these arrests in our district, because the labs we have in Indiana and rural Pennsylvania and others are dangerous and addictive and threatening the kids in those labs, but they are only cooking for themselves and maybe two other people, whereas the superlabs will ship it to thousands of people. California has been the leader in passing child abuse laws; and other States need to emulate that, that if they have a lab, because of the terrible deaths of kids getting exploded by their parents cooking and the dangers of the superlabs, but we need to focus on meth and crystal meth and ice and all the different variations like we had

on LSD to get this kind of trend and keep the law enforcement pressure on with the stigma pressure and with an education and prevention pressure.

One other thing. We are doing an OxyContin hearing in Orlando. They have had a series of deaths in that city because of overdoses on OxyContin. It is a difficult issue because they can have legitimate uses. Just like in meth, it is tough to regulate out of Brussels and out of Amsterdam and through Canada because ephedrine is not illegal. It has legal uses too. But the fact is we have to have the courage to stand up to some drug companies that do not want us to talk about the dangers of misuse of some legitimate drugs.

The President last night boldly addressed steroids. We heard, particularly those of us who are baseball fans, some questions being asked about records that were falling; and out of that process we learned more and more that in multiple sports that the success stories were because people were artificially pumping themselves up. As that pressure spread and as we listen to the stories of athletes in junior high and high school, the sad stories of these kids who are afraid they cannot get college scholarships, who are afraid they cannot be pro athletes, who are afraid they cannot advance unless they cheat, unless they alter their body, who are even more vulnerable than the baseball, football, basketball, wrestling, boxing stars who pump themselves up who have millions of dollars to get physician advice, who still destroy their bodies, now imagine being a young person who is still growing, who is filling out, who does not get the medical advice, and is putting their life at risk, not just damaging their body but putting their life at risk. And the President had the courage last night, like the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and others here in this body, to talk about the abuse in athletics and how we have to tackle that. Just like the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and others have been leaders in trying to raise the issue of OxyContin here and the meth caucus in this Congress to try to address the meth questions, we have to work at the stigma.

One other thing in this general category. If we continue to succeed in the eradication, if we continue to succeed in the interdiction at the borders, if we continue to succeed in arresting the dealers and those who are working with that, if we can up our prevention efforts and if we can put through drug testing and an accountability provision in, we still have to worry about those who are addicted. And the President last night had a couple of references. One is, in drug treatment, he has an expansion of drug treatment. We have been increasing that rapidly here; and we need to continue to do that because, quite frankly, if we do not stop the number of people coming in, we cannot,

as Nancy Reagan so eloquently said, win a war just by treating the wounded. At the same time, we still have to treat the wounded. And if we can rehabilitate those who are addicted, we have a major impact on the drug problems in the United States. And the President proposed a faith-based initiative.

But he did one other thing. I support mandatory sentences for certain crimes because I do not like how the legal system is letting certain people off based on how rich they are or what color they are and getting to make up what sentences they have based on their legal representation. There ought to be the same accountability. If one is a dealer, this is what they get. If one is a multiple user, if one is driving somebody to a drug bust, this ought to be their penalty. Our crime reductions in the United States, in the streets of the United States, and 75 to 85 percent of all crime is drug and alcohol related, are because we locked more people up; but our prisons are jammed. Many of those people are now coming out of their sentences, and the question is what are we going to do? They are starting to re-enter our economy. They are going to be back, and if all they learned was to how to be a better criminal, if their kids, who now lost their mom or dad because they were in prison and did not get any help, instead of being able to pull themselves up out of their situation, are now destroyed, we are in deep trouble in society.

One of the other initiatives that the President announced last night was a major initiative to deal with housing kids of prisoners and initiatives in re-entry courts. There are a number of programs around the United States ranging from drug courts and looking for accountability of how to get drug courts that Director John Walters is trying to do and to get more patterns with it; but it is an innovative thing with an accountability, with the judge that people are working through. The drug testing is part of that, trying to include faith-based groups that put a religious and friend and volunteer accountability with it. But we also need to look at real problems of people not wanting to hire people when they are coming out of prison, people not yet wanting to let them in their apartment complex when they come out of prison.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who is on our subcommittee and is my colleague from Chicago from the other party, I am cosponsoring his legislation for trying to deal with the housing that often people who are coming out of prison face. The President understood that in addition to the Andean initiative, in addition to boosting the DEA, our critical anti-drug area, in addition to working with Homeland Security to make our borders secure from narco-terrorism and providing drug money to terrorists around the country that we have to do something to help rehabilitate those who have been in prison and we need to help them both

from a personal standpoint, as they deserve it as a human soul, and from a practical standpoint for the rest of us as they are coming out of prison. They have been locked up. Our crime rate has been down. Are we really prepared for the changes we are going to see if we have not invested in those people?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recently visited a prison in my district, a Federal prison; and 80 percent of those there were addicted to a drug. I believe the figure was 60 percent were there because they were selling drugs. That is a huge figure, \$35,000 per person to incarcerate people. We certainly can afford to invest in drug treatment and in prevention.

But I wanted to mention the issue of methamphetamine again. The gentleman talked about the big labs in California. I come from a very rural area. There is hardly a month that goes by that in our local community, a small town, the local paper talks of another meth bust, another lab found.

And I want to tell the Members the story of Suzie. Her name is not Suzie, but I want to protect the family. I remember vividly when Suzie moved to our area. She married a person locally who was very successful, a family. She was pleasant. She was attractive. She was smart. And as years rolled by, I had heard that Suzie might have a cocaine problem. I did not know. But I do know this: over a year ago, or maybe it was 2 years ago now, there was a major meth bust in our region, and it was proven that she was one of the kingpins. She was the person who was buying the material, a lot of the material to make methamphetamines, at the hardware store: lye, paint thinners, a lot of chemicals that one would not think have anything to do with ingesting in one's body. In fact, in my region the drug stores have all the Sudafed-type health medicines behind the pharmacy because they do not allow them out there because they are being purchased by people who come in time and time again and get them because that is a main ingredient to make meth. So it shows us the problem is rampant. It took 4 years to get the kingpin. DEA, the State drug team, the local police worked 4 years to get the person. And Suzie was the person who helped them nail him because before they never could get the kingpin. And he is now in prison, I think, for 40 or 45 years. But residue is he has taught so many people how to make high-quality meth that we remain a meth production area. And the police tell me they just do not know how to get their arms around it because every time they turn around, they hear another lead, they go check, they find another meth lab. I mean, they are everywhere.

So that is a story of a destroyed life. The final page on Suzie is I got to know her pretty well because she was volunteering in the nursing homes and the personal care homes and my moth-

er was there, and she was always very nice to my mother and we talked a bit. And I always wanted to sit down with her and talk with her about how it happened because she was going out also speaking to school groups. Several months ago on a Sunday morning, after friends had talked to her on Saturday night and she was in good spirits, she was found hanging in an old pump house in the woods, dead. Suzie lost her life because we heard, the kingpin said, and I do not know if they can ever prove it, but the kingpin said she will not live long. Suzie did not live long. She was a person in her late 40s. She was a mature woman. She was attractive. She was smart. But she got hooked on drugs. And if a person her age can get hooked, how vulnerable are our eighth, ninth and tenth graders as they are still growing and working to become adults? And that is why drug testing is so important. It is about protecting kids, not about penalizing kids.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and this is not a matter of condemning Americans. It is a matter of trying to develop a fully holistic policy to try to reduce drug and alcohol abuse. The fact is the President of the United States in his amazing address last night again acknowledged he overcame his addiction, or at least overuse of alcohol. One of my favorite commentators, Rush Limbaugh, had to battle with an addiction with OxyContin. Clearly, it strikes all types of people. It is not just the stereotypical people. And we need to reach out to people who are hurting and try to help them recover. We need to make sure that part of that is eliminating the temptation as much as possible, trying to keep the prices high enough, the supply low enough. We need to try to make sure there is an accountability on the dealers and those who are using it so they know if they want public money, whether it is if they are going to a public school, that there is going to be an accountability and somebody watching them for their own good and that there is also going to be help there in treatment and follow-up if they need it. Does the gentleman from California want to make a comment?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I do have some disagreements with the gentleman as to the best way to attack this problem, but I certainly agree that we should make sure that young people understand just how serious the problem is for them and that there would be no greater method of telling them and putting a stamp of disapproval on it than making sure they have to have a drug test.

But the gentleman referred to on the chart there some of the decrease in drug use that we have had over the last 2 years, and I think that a lot of that can be attributed also to a stamp of disapproval that the young people understand that our society has given just in the last few years. In the last administration, I think that it could be

accurately said that people who were out fighting this problem were faced by an administration that trivialized the use of drugs as to what kind of threat it was when the President talked about not inhaling and such. And some of us who have had pretty wild youths in our time looked at that and said this man is not being serious, and the young people looked at the President and said this is not being serious, and our administration's seriousness on this has had a lot to do with the reduction in the use of drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, last night the President highlighted the success of our Nation's drug strategy. I applaud the President for the success of his strategy and for highlighting this issue in the State of the Union Address. Across the Nation, the latest study found there has been an 11-percent decline in drug use by 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students over the past 2 years. This finding translates into 400,000 fewer teens using drugs and is the first real decline nationally in 12 years. Our own local survey done by the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati has shown similar results over the past 3 or 4 years. This is very encouraging news for parents, teenagers, teachers and everyone else who cares about the welfare of kids.

As the President mentioned last night, community involvement is critical to successful drug prevention. Community coalitions are the heart and soul of drug prevention and community action on this important topic. Coalitions help all of us to come together—parents, teachers, coaches, religious leaders, volunteers, law enforcement—to encourage youth to understand that any drug use is not only unacceptable but harmful. Having fewer youths use drugs is important because we know that if young people can abstain from drugs before they graduate from high school, they are much less likely to have drug problems later.

The Drug-Free Communities Act is an essential tool that many of our communities utilize to fight illegal drug abuse. Instead of creating new Federal bureaucracies, this program sends Federal money directly to local coalitions working to reduce the demand for drugs through effective education and prevention. Community coalitions are groups of citizens—parents, youths, business, media, law enforcement, religious organizations, civic groups, health care professionals, and others—who are working on local initiatives to reduce and prevent substance abuse. These coalitions are engaged in a wide variety of activities and strategies specifically tailored to the needs of their communities.

We know that coalitions are making a difference. Due to the great work of the Coalition for Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, there was a 41-percent decrease in marijuana use and 23-percent decrease in alcohol use among 7th graders from 1993 to 2000. In a similar region where a coalition did not exist, there was a 33-percent increase in marijuana use and no change in alcohol use. The coalition, which I founded 8 years ago, is a comprehensive, long-term effort to mobilize every sector of the Greater Cincinnati community to take an active role in preventing substance abuse. It brings local community organizations

together with business leaders, parents, teens, clergy, law enforcement, and school officials to implement antidrug initiatives, and has become a model for dozens of communities nationwide. I know that there are similar coalitions in more than 5,000 communities nationwide doing this good work and they need our support.

The positive results highlighted today indicate that prevention tools like community coalitions work to create safe neighborhoods and a better future for our young people.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1545

PROVIDING HEALTH CARE FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues for that last special order, for the way that we are going to make sure that the young people in this country understand that drugs pose a threat to them is to have just this type of presentation in Congress and this type of discussion, serious discussion, with them as to the threat that drugs pose to their well-being.

With that, however, I would like to now, in my hour, raise a discussion on another issue that I believe is perhaps the most serious threat to the well-being of the American people. I have introduced a bill today that will give my colleagues a stark choice. They can do what will help big business, but will, at the same time, do great damage to the American people as a whole; or they can support the legislation that I am proposing, which will be a big step toward eliminating the greatest threat to the well-being of the American people.

Drugs is certainly a threat, but I will tell you that I believe the greatest threat to the American people as we stand here today is the still uncontrolled flood of illegal immigration into our society. All the other problems that we have, including drug use in our own country, are exacerbated by this uncontrolled flow of illegal immigrants into the United States of America. If we do not get control of this, it will surely destroy our country as we know it in the years ahead.

Yes, we can absorb legal immigrants in a fairly high number. I am proud

that we have a little more than 1 million legal immigrants coming into our country every year, one-half of one percent of growth or so of our population. Certainly we can absorb that kind of immigration flow. But what we have had in these last 15 years, and especially in the last 10 years, is a massive increase in the flow of illegal immigrants into our country.

Perhaps it can be traced back to the 1986 amnesty bill that passed through this Congress and was signed into law, unfortunately, by my President, President Ronald Reagan. That bill was hard-fought on this House floor, and I understand that my colleague, Mr. Dan Lundgren, is the father of that portion of the bill that insisted on amnesty for those illegal immigrants that were already in the country.

Once that amnesty took place, once this legislation was passed in 1986, the word went out throughout the whole world that if you get to the United States, you are going to get the benefits of the people of the United States, and you can outwait the American people because we have such good hearts that there will be another amnesty, and yet another. The flow of illegal immigration after 1986, instead of decreasing, dramatically increased. Surprise, surprise.

No, the people who passed that need to take responsibility for their actions. That piece of legislation has caused great damage to us. In California, our schools, the education system, is under incredible pressure. Our criminal justice system is almost breaking down under the weight of illegal immigrants, with 30 and 40 percent of those who are held in incarceration at times being illegal immigrants. Our healthcare system, our emergency rooms are breaking down under the pressure and the strain of illegal immigrants. And that is what leads me to the legislation which I introduced today.

This legislation that I introduced today flows directly from a confrontation that I had with the leaders of this body over whether a provision should have been included in the Medicare reform bill that provided \$1 billion in order to pay for the emergency healthcare for illegal immigrants in those States where illegal immigration is most prevalent.

I opposed that and I was not going to vote for the Medicare bill because of that, but the leadership in the House agreed that if I would vote for the Medicare bill, that I could write legislation that would, in some way, mitigate the damage that I felt was inherent in providing U.S. tax dollars officially to pay for services, health services, for people who have come to this country or are currently in this country illegally.

I voted for the Medicare bill. I voted for it before it went to the Senate. When it came back from the Senate I only voted for it with this understanding. So today the bill that I place into the hopper is in direct relationship

to the Medicare bill that passed through this House, that, yes, indeed, took care of the prescription drug needs of many of our seniors, but, at the same time, did include an extraneous provision for providing \$1 billion in healthcare for illegal immigrants.

With that, I would say that the hospitals and emergency rooms on our Nation's borders, especially those in California, are certainly now going broke trying to treat illegal aliens who are streaming into their facilities. And there is no doubt about this pressure. There is no doubt about the horrible impact that it is having.

But the reasons are twofold for the pressure on these hospitals and emergency rooms. Illegal aliens, first of all, normally, or at least quite often, if not normally, we do not have the exact statistics because they are operating in a black area of our society, we do not know all of the statistics about what illegal aliens have or do not have, we assume they are normally working at jobs with no healthcare benefits. Couple that with the fact that Congress insists and the law now insists that hospital emergency rooms treat every patient who walks through those doors of their emergency room, that they must be treated according to law.

America, with those two realities facing us, number one, that people who come here illegally generally are working at jobs without healthcare benefits, meaning the people who run the businesses do not provide them healthcare, but the taxpayers end up providing the health care, coupled with the fact that the emergency rooms feel that they are required by law to take care of anyone who walks through the door, what we have done is created a situation where America has now become the HMO to the whole world.

We are taking care of illegal immigrants, any illegal immigrant, who can get to our country and get to that emergency room. Sometimes we are not talking about just emergency treatment, about what common sense would tell us is emergency treatment; we are talking about extended cancer treatments, we are talking about treatments for diseases that are congenital, we are talking about diseases that someone clearly had when they came to the United States. We are talking about diseases that require hundreds of thousands of dollars, and sometimes even up to \$1 million, in treatment.

With this Medicare bill that we provided, \$1 billion for the emergency healthcare for illegal immigrants, that is the first time any money has been spent to provide services for illegal immigrants in our country, so this is a watershed. This is that moment.

In doing that, did that same bill try to fix the situation by enforcing our immigration laws on the border and insisting that these immigration laws be enforced if we provide that \$1 billion? No, that was not in the bill. Did Congress try to fix the situation by saying that emergency rooms can turn away